



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

For convenience, I give all the details in a tabular form:—

No.	Popu- lation.	Number of Marriages.	Num- ber of Births.	Num- ber of Deaths.	Marriages to Popu- lation.	Births to Popu- lation.	Deaths to Popu- lation.	Excess of Births above Marriages per cent.	Doub- ling Period.
1	2,021	29	84	43	65	24	47	95	34·30
2	2,056	21	109	33	98	19	62	230	19
3	2,170	20	119	23	108	18	94	417	15·59
4	2,935	37	95	25	79	30	101	227	30·84
5	2,187	15	72	22	145	30	99	227	30
6	2,268	28	83	20	81	27	113	315	25·29
7	2,877	33	117	73	87	24	39	60	45·40
8	2,689	38	91	48	70	29	56	89	43·66
9	4,014	38	151	90	105	26	44	67	45·40
10	3,341	56	112	71	59	29	47	57	56

From these statements it will appear, that the births are fewest, and the mortality greatest in the town, while the opposite state of things prevail in the country, and especially in the more elevated part. All this is in accordance with our European experience. Even to the native constitution the clear air of the mountain side, with the thermometer between 70° and 80°, would appear to be more conducive to health, than the close atmosphere of the plain, where it is between 80° and 90°. Another inference may fairly be drawn from this inquiry, limited as it is, that a native population under the tropics, in the enjoyment of peace, with a fair share of industry, a sufficiency of fertile land, and a favourable climate, may increase as an European one in a temperate climate with similar advantages.

I am quite sensible of the limited and imperfect nature of the statements I am now submitting to the Statistical Section, and I furnish them only because I am not aware that any of a similar nature for a tropical climate, and an indigenous population, have been laid before the public. Baron Humboldt's, for some villages in Mexico, are the nearest approach, but they relate, not to a purely native, but to a mixed native and European population.

Remarks on the Plan adopted for taking the Census in 1841, with suggestions for its improvement. By the Rev. E. WYATT-EDGELL.

[Read before the Statistical Society of London, 20th November, 1848.]

OF the five enumerations which have been made of the people of Great Britain, four merely gave the numbers of individuals resident in each parish and county; together with some information, more or less detailed, concerning their ages, occupations and dwellings. But the last census made in 1841, was far more comprehensive. It was a catalogue strictly so called; for it not only recorded the number of individuals, but it also gave the name and description of each. In theory therefore, nothing could be more perfect than the census of 1841; but there were imperfections in the *practical arrangement*, which have prevented its producing all the benefit which might

have been expected from it. I shall endeavour to point out these, and to suggest the remedies;—premising only that my suggestions will be applicable principally, if not exclusively, to rural districts.

The season of Christmas preferable to that of Midsummer for taking the Census.

1. Hitherto, the census has been taken at the beginning of June; and the reason assigned for the arrangement was the greater length of daylight at that season, which was thought to afford the enumerators more time for completing their labours. But, supposing that the appointment of the time had rested with me, I should rather have chosen the season when the days were *shortest*; because the enumerators of the rural districts would then have had a better chance of finding the labourers at their homes; an important consideration, and one which it is worth while making great sacrifices to accomplish.

Any person will understand my meaning who reflects for a moment what a difference it must make to an enumerator, whether he be employed to draw up the list of a family from the testimony of one or two individuals (perhaps children), or whether he have to draw it up with all the members of the family assembled in his presence. In the former case, it takes him a long time to render himself intelligible; he is perplexed with a variety of contradictory and imperfect answers, and he is obliged to leave frequent blanks in his schedule, or, what is worse, to fill them up by guess. In the latter case, he sees his work before him, his eye corrects his ear while setting down the answers he receives; if one of the party make a false statement another is sure to interpose and correct it; and the list is completed in a few minutes, probably without any, but certainly without a material error.

I speak from experience on this subject, having twice filled the office of assistant enumerator in a rural district. On each occasion the weather was fine, and, as was to be expected in the month of June, men, women and children were engaged in the fields, potato-hoeing, podding and other occupations, which being done by task-work detained them from home until seven or eight o'clock in the evening. The consequence was, that every other cottage at which we arrived was found empty and the door locked, or else left in charge of a few children or a neighbour, who could give us but very imperfect information. I do not hesitate to say that, had it not been for my previous knowledge of the people as their clergyman, our schedules must have contained ten errors for every hundred entries. Now, suppose that the season appointed for our work had been Christmas instead of June, we should then have had the advantage of several hours of dark evening, during which we might have visited the cottages with the certainty of finding the mothers and children, if not the fathers also, at home; and our labour would have been lightened with the consciousness that we were sure of the truth of what we were recording. But I need not dwell longer on this part of the subject, because enough has been said to prove that it is of the greatest importance for enumerators to have the opportunity of *seeing* the families they describe; and that, in rural districts at least, this object can only be accomplished by taking the census during the long winter evenings.

2. A second objection to taking the census at Midsummer is, that so many families are then absent from their proper homes (which circumstance, though it does not affect the amount, may hereafter detract from the usefulness of the census); and so many others escape enumeration altogether.

There is no part of the year, except Autumn, when the population is so *displaced* as in June. The migration of the Irish labourers is then commencing. In the English counties, many families of the higher and middle classes are making tours, and consequently living in hotels or hired lodgings; the peasantry too are scattered over the country in search of work. While, with respect to the metropolis, not only is there a very large immigration into the parishes of the west end, but there is also a considerable emigration of the poor from the southern and eastern parishes. The custom is increasing every year more and more for operatives of the lowest class to leave London in the summer, and seek agricultural employment in Kent, Essex and Surrey; they travel with their wives and children, two or three families forming a gang or company, and live in barns or in the open air: in fact, to a certain degree, they are taking the place of the Irish labourers. Now these families are not only omitted from the schedules of their respective parishes, where in winter they would have been set down as paupers or otherwise, but for the most part they escape enumeration altogether. If the farmer employing them be a man who takes an interest in these matters, he gives notice that there are such and such families on his farm, *but if not, they are entirely lost to the census*. Whether there is the same kind of summer emigration from other large cities as well as from the metropolis, I am not able to say; but when we consider the number of labourers in search of work, together with gipsies, vagrants and people attending races and fairs, we cannot doubt that the whole amount of the population living in tents and barns during the month of June far exceeds 19,742, at which number it (together with "persons in boats and barges") was reckoned in 1841.

3. A third reason for preferring Christmas to June (not indeed an important one, but still worthy of consideration) is, that it will make the time of the census coincide with the end of a year. And, if the change be made by anticipation, *i. e.* from June 1851 to December 1850, it will bring it to the close of the *decade*,—and eventually to the close of the *century*.

4. There is still another argument in favour of appointing the season of Christmas, and that is the circumstance of its *being a festival*. There are persons who would then consider they were performing a social duty in giving a list of their households, but who at any other time would endeavour to avoid it: and among the higher and middle classes this good feeling is increased by the custom, so proverbial, of uniting all the family circle at Christmas.

Of the Birth-place Inquiry, and the means by which it may be most effectually carried out.

The inquiry respecting the places of nativity, if not the most important, is yet, in some respects, the most interesting portion of a census. For (to say nothing of the assistance it may afford in ethno-

logical and sanatory questions, and the vulgar errors on those subjects it may serve to dispel) there can be no doubt that when combined with our improved system of registration, this inquiry will render that of ages unnecessary; inasmuch as experienced clerks, with well arranged registers, and the names and birthplaces of individuals given, can find ages in less time than enumerators labouring under so many disadvantages can elicit them. And if this be the case, it will enable us to dispense with the most offensive inquiry of the census, and the one which forms the greatest obstacle to its future extension and improvement. Lastly, let it be remembered that the questions respecting birth-places are, of all others, the most easily put and the most correctly answered. Many people object to telling their employments, and many do not scruple to falsify their ages, but none show any reluctance to tell the place of their nativity; on the contrary, most persons appear to take a pleasure in it.

All these advantages of the inquiry, however, were lost in the last census of England, owing to the very restricted plan on which it was carried out. The enumerator was directed to ask the persons whom he visited, whether they were born in the county within which they were dwelling at the time, and, according to the answers he received, to write *y* or *n* (*yes* or *no*,) against their names. In the abstract afterwards published, the results of these answers appeared against each parish, hundred and county, in two columns headed respectively with the words, "Born in the County," "Born elsewhere." Thus Dale in Lincolnshire contained, in a population of 1,700 persons, 1,622 natives of the county, and 78 born out of it; while, in the borough of Southwark, which had in round numbers 100,000 inhabitants, 50,000 were tabulated as natives of Surrey.

Parish, &c.	Population.	Place of Birth.	
		Born in the County.	Born elsewhere.
Dale	1,700	1,622	78
Southwark	100,000	50,000	50,000

Now an obvious remark, which everyone must make when he reads this table, is its *uselessness*. One hardly sees how the information which it contains, can further any social or moral inquiry whatever. What, for instance, do we gain by knowing that every other inhabitant of Southwark was born out of Surrey? The fact throws no light on the subject of the migration of the people from the country to towns, or from towns to the country; for the inhabitant of Southwark who is not a native of Surrey, may, nevertheless, have been born in Middlesex, not half a mile off. And the same remark applies to large towns in general, situated as they mostly are on rivers and on the edges of their respective counties.

Valuable therefore and interesting as the birth-place inquiry might have been, it has, in the last census, been rendered useless by the manner in which it has been restricted.

The remedy which I would propose is, that the enumerators be directed not to inquire whether the individual was *born in the county in which he is at present dwelling?* (which is an intricate and difficult question,) but simply, *Where he was born?* and to enter the answer as he receives it, or with only such further addition as may be necessary in order to identify the locality.

How all these answers should be tabulated in the abstract is a subject for future consideration. The square arrangement of counties (of which there is such an admirable specimen in the Irish census, p. 446,) is not applicable to England, where the counties have no individual or distinctive character. But the divisions of Mr. Fletcher's map, or some other such divisions carried more into detail, and then put into the form of a square table, would be highly instructive and interesting. Or two columns, headed with *Town* and *Country* (or similar words), may run parallel with the list of parishes; and all the birth-places being divided into these two groups, the figures in the columns may designate the number of inhabitants who come from each. In that case, there must be some list or diagram for the purpose of defining to which of the classes each place belongs. And it is also evident that additional labour will be required on the part of the tabulator, because, instead of merely counting the *Y's* and *N's* of the column, he will have first to reduce the localities to classes, and then to count the results.

If the additional labour of this process be considered as an objection to the plan I suggest, there will still remain the alternative of altogether omitting the birth-places in the abstract, and leaving them for future inquirers to consult as they stand in the enumerator's schedules, which will always be open for their inspection. Indeed, until we know more clearly than at present for what kind of researches this part of the census will be wanted, we can scarcely decide how to tabulate it; and perhaps the best mode of rendering it available to science, is to leave it as it stands in the schedules of the enumerators.

Of the Age Inquiry, and of the disadvantages arising from the adoption of Quinquennial Periods.

The third alteration I would propose is similar to the preceding, inasmuch as the object of it is to substitute a simple for an intricate question; and, by so doing, to render the information not only more extensive, but *also* more accurate.

At the last census, the enumerator was directed to enter the ages in his schedule by *quinquennial periods*:—that is to say—if an individual were fifty-four, he was to write *fifty*; if forty-two, he was to write down *forty*; if twenty-six, *twenty-five*; and so to fifteen, below which age the number was to be entered in the usual manner.

The disadvantage of this arrangement is that, whilst rendering the information less precise, and therefore less valuable, it *also* renders it more difficult to obtain:—and this without any compensating advantage. For one does not see what purpose is gained by thus substituting columns of fives and tens for the actual sums,—round numbers for precise figures,—imperfect for perfect knowledge.

If it be said that the round numbers were sufficiently accurate for the purpose of any social or sanatory question, and that, as it was

intended to publish them only in the abstract, further detail was superfluous in the schedules; still the principal objection remains, namely, *the trouble the quinquennial arrangement caused to the enumerator*. It imposed on him part of the work which properly belonged to the *tabulator*. In order to reduce the ages to groups of fives and tens, he was obliged to be perpetually making calculations, each small in itself, but very perplexing in the aggregate:—and this at a time when his whole attention should have been devoted to the work of visiting and eliciting information. Division of labour is essential in collecting statistics. The enumerator's work is to visit the people, and to record their answers as nearly as possible in the terms in which he receives them; to modify and classify these answers should be the subsequent work of the *tabulator*. And if the two operations are not kept distinct, embarrassment is sure to ensue, and endless mistakes in consequence.

But there was yet a further difficulty in the arrangement, for the enumerator had not only to make calculations for himself, he had also to contend against the miscalculations of others. Long prior to his visit, a rumour had gone forth that there was to be a five years' reduction of ages; and when he came, he found people had not been slow to avail themselves of it. We may easily imagine the confusion it must have caused him to set them right. It was next to impossible to make people understand that they were *not required to deduct five years from their age, but only to deduct the remainder which exceeded the multiples of five their ages contained*. No doubt there was a want of will as often as a want of capacity to understand the problem. Be this, however, as it may, the errors which this quinquennial arrangement must have given rise to, directly or indirectly, are beyond computation.

Now the alteration which I propose is that, in future, the enumerator should be instructed:—

I. Simply to ask the age of the parties whom he visits, and (as a general rule) to enter the answer in his schedule, *as he receives it*.

II. If, however, the answer be given in round numbers, as 40, 50, 60, then the enumerator must repeat his question, asking for a more precise answer; and if this should be refused, he will put his figures between brackets, to denote uncertainty.

III. If the persons visited decline answering the question of age at all, the enumerator must not press his demand, but use his own conjecture; and set down his figures, as before, between brackets, to denote that it is a conjecture.

IV. On the day after the census, or as soon after as may be convenient, the enumerator will proceed to the Clergyman of the parish, and in company with him and a Churchwarden, or some old inhabitant whom he will be empowered to summon, he will compare his schedule with the parochial register, and verify or correct the ages and the spelling of the names thereby; the verification being underlined, and the corrections made in red ink. They will afterwards sign a certificate in the following form:—

“We, Rev. John Smith, officiating minister, William Brown, churchwarden (or householder), and Henry Staples, enumerator, of the parish of Ayleford, have compared the above Schedule with the

parochial register of baptisms; out of 860 ages therein mentioned we have verified or corrected 634 by the said register. And we have also, by the said register, as well as by the register books of marriages and deaths, corrected the spelling, so as to render the surname of all the members of the same family as far as possible uniform."

V. Should there be any other than a *church* register kept in the district, the enumerator will proceed to the minister who has the care of it, and compare his schedule with it as before.

VI. He will then proceed with his schedule to the registrar of the district, and compare it in like manner.

VII. Having compared his schedule with the parochial and other registers, the enumerator will compare it with the schedule of the previous census; and for that purpose will be empowered to send for the former enumerator (if he be living, and in the neighbourhood). They will then underline with black ink all the names which are identical in the two schedules; and whenever the descriptions annexed to the names are contradictory, they will use their discretion in deciding which of the two documents is most likely to be correct, and alter in black ink, or make a note of them accordingly. Their certificate will be as follows:—

"We, Henry Staples, enumerator of the census of 1851, and Thomas Jones, enumerator of the census of 1841, have compared together our respective schedules; out of 860 names entered in the schedule of 1851, we find 593 also in the schedule of 1841, and the contradictions, of which there are 13, we have altered to the best of our knowledge and belief."

By thus avoiding quinquennial periods as well as everything else which tends to create confusion during the process of enumeration, and by adopting every available check, we may hope to improve this hitherto very unsatisfactory part of the census. But, as I before suggested, the true principle of carrying out the age inquiry, is through the places of nativity.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Statistical Return of Wines entered for Home Consumption from 1792 to 1848.

	Average Population.	Portugal.	Spanish.	French.	Madeira.	Rhenish.	Marsala.	Total Gallons.
	About	Galls.	Galls.	Galls.	Galls.	Galls.	Galls.	
1792 to 1802	15,000,000	4,156,580	1,058,820	53,760	167,790	10,710	34,860	5,462,520
1821	21,193,458	2,343,509	959,834	159,462	400,476	21,921	69,112	4,686,885
1841	26,893,094	2,387,017	2,412,821	553,740	107,701	53,242	401,439	6,184,960
1842	Population supposed to be about 29,000,000	1,288,953	2,261,786	360,692	65,209	53,585	393,020	4,815,222
1843		2,517,709	2,311,639	326,498	95,589	49,943	416,643	4,968,987
1844		2,887,501	2,478,360	473,789	111,577	53,865	531,051	6,536,141
1845		2,688,084	2,554,877	543,330	102,745	62,519	707,937	6,559,492
1846		2,669,798	2,602,490	409,506	94,580	64,478	508,002	6,348,864
1847		2,360,851	2,372,178	397,329	81,349	55,774	470,386	5,727,867